DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 546 EC 210 315

AUTHOR Hardaway, Pamela
TITLE Inservice Training of Special Educators in Special Education Law.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; *Educational Change; *Educational History; *Educational Legislation; Educational Practices; Federal Legislation; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Knowledge Level; Special Education; *Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This research review examines the historical development of training programs for special education teachers, beginning with their apprenticeship at residential institutions for handicapped children. Federal legislation brought about reform in the preparation of special education teachers, by authorizing grants to universities and colleges to train personnel working with the handicapped. The need for inservice training was brought about by rapid changes in the field of special education, causing school systems, state education agencies, and professional organizations to seek to broaden and update the skills and knowledge of school personnel. Efforts are now being made to identify quality practices in the preparation of special education personnel. In conjunction with this, researchers have studied the topics of teacher competencies, teacher certification, and classroom problems, among others. Though few empirical studies were located concerning the legal aspects of Public Law 94-142, researchers have suggested that teachers should become more acquainted with the legal elements of their profession. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED296546

INSERVICE TRAINING OF SPECIAL EDUCATORS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION LAW

Pamela Hardaway

EC 210315

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pamela Hardaway
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Historically the education and training of special education teachers took place at residential institutions for handicapped children. Ysseldyke and Algozzine (1982) stated that the idea of special education teacher training evolved from the obvious failure of apprenticeship to meet the needs of all children when compulsory education became a reality. Teachers learned by working with children.

Formal training of teachers for the handicapped became necessary when schools were forced to accept more and more children. Mayer (1961) stated that if the state insisted that all children attend school, then the state should also insist that teachers possess a minimal level of

competency. Thus, state "certification" of teachers became a political and ethical necessity. The plan to train special education teachers was simple. Lincoln (1903) stated that the best possible teachers were selected. Women who had teaching experience and were acquainted with kindergarten methods were prime candidates to teach handicapped children. Sarason and Doris (1979) reported that the Vineland Training School in New Jersey was active in training teachers through a series of summer school programs. Some teachers were trained in other institutions such as Gallaudet College, University of Pennsylvania, and New York University (Craig, 1942). Connor (1976) found that by 1929 courses for the preparation of teachers and supervisors of retarded children were offered at 99 institutions of higher learning throughout the country. Schleier (1931) recommended that, except in unusual circumstances, only one training center be established in each state in order to accomplish the following:

a. prevent unnecessary duplication of courses in a state;

b. eliminate the need to conduct programs for small groups of students;

c. eliminate duplication of equipment and special facilities; and

d. keep the cost at a minimum.

The first major force for special education reform came in 1958 with passage of the Grant for Teaching in the Education of Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 83-926 (Zettel & Ballard, 1983). The law authorized grants to universities and colleges to train administrators to manage personnel in the areas of retardation, and grants to state education agencies for training teachers of the mentally retarded (Burke, 1976). In 1963 P.L. 83-926 was amended by the Mental Retardation Facilities and

Community Mental Health Center Construction Act, P.L. 88-164 to include support for the training of personnel in other disability areas (LaVor, 1976).

The first Education for All Handicapped Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-230), established the federal commitment to training personnel in special education, as did the amendments in 1974, P.L. 93-380 and 1975, P.L. 94-142 (Zettel & Ballard, 1983). Part D of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 specifically addresses training special education personnel. It is clear that the training provisions in P.L. 94-142 impact on personnel preparation relationships among state agencies, colleges and universities, local education agencies, and the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (Burke, 1976).

As in other fields of teacher training, special education is undergoing significant changes (Thiagarajan, Semmel, & Semmel, 1974). There is a growing need to supply the nation with sufficient numbers of teachers to meet the demands for special education services. Emphasis must be placed on improving the quality of the teacher training process and product (Thiagarajan et al., 1974).

In order to obtain P.L. 94-142 funding, a state must submit an annual plan demonstrating compliance to federal law and addressing several requirements which include personnel development (Warnat, 1978). Prescribed in P.L. 94-142 is a comprehensive system for personnel development (CSPD). The component consists of inservice training, personnel development plan and dissemination of information. This provision requires local school districts to assess annually the training needs of all personnel involved in educating handicapped

students and to provide programs designed to meet documented needs (Maher & Bennett, 1984). Furthermore, the law requires the dissemination of significant information derived from educational research to teachers and administrators (Hardin, 1982).

Maher and Bennett (1984) stated that the education of exceptional children requires the involvement of many individuals, including teachers, administrators and specialists. In order to effectively perform the educational service delivery functions, these personnel must possess specific job-related competencies. Personnel development is the component of the special services system responsible for assuring that these critical proficiencies are developed and maintained.

Personnel development is a necessary part of the special education service delivery system for a variety of reasons. The most important reasons relate to the following:

1. the dynamic nature of special education and its related fields
2. employee stress and burnout and
3. professional and legal requirements (Maher & Bennett, 1984).

Lugo (1978) stated that most of the training of personnel in special education is achieved at the college level and training programs are very similar. There is coursework and there is field work. The preservice special education teacher is primarily trained in a relatively artificial setting. Even though universities strive to provide training in real situations, it is still an academic process. Inservice education is always needed to follow up (Lugo, 1978). De Jong (1978) emphasized that special education teacher training focus primarily on the following areas:

1. information and knowledge of the handicapped;

2. attitudes applicable and functional in relation toward special education; and

3. curriculum.

Competency-based approaches to training personnel are well documented (Brown & York, 1974; Lakin & Reynolds, 1982; Reynolds, 1980; Reynolds, 1982; Scheurman, 1976; Tucker & Horner, 1977; Wilcox, 1977). In each case, competencies are behaviorally defined.

The basic components of instructional programs determine what to teach, how to teach, the ability to select general materials, and the ability to measure progress (Brown & York, 1974). Reynolds (1980) listed 10 "Clusters of capabilities" for training special education teachers. Each Cluster is a competency-based approach. These "Clusters of Capabilities" are defined in Appendix B. Tucker and Horner (1977) discussed the competency-based approach to teacher preparation. He listed 25 training modules and paired them with areas for demonstration of teacher proficiency. Burton and Hirshoren (1979) suggested that the title of "management technicians" would be more appropriate than teacher. Warnat (1978) suggested the following points when training special education personnel:

1. The population in need of training include school administrators, both special education and regular classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, specialists, parents and parent surrogates.

2. Clearly evident is the need to inform personnel involved with the education of handicapped children of the implications of the legal procedures, as well as to prepare them to facilitate the most appropriate placement and educational environment for the handicapped child. It can be safety assumed that no segment of the training population is adequately prepared in this area.

3. Implications of P.L. 94-142 for personnel development are as follows:

   a. While the Act emphasizes the importance of inservice training, no mention is made of the need for, or the

preparation of the training of trainers. It is assumed that the greatest proportion of training activities will be continued by the local public school system, which will also be responsible for providing appropriate educational services for the handicapped children. This crucial concern pertaining to trainer training must be addressed if highly skilled trainers are to be qualified to train in the areas of due process, least restrictive environment, and individualized educational programs.

b. While higher education has been responsible to the preparation of special educators, mostly at the graduate level, it has been relatively unresponsive to addressing both preservice and inservice training needs for regular educators.

c. The trainee population to be affected most dramatically by P.L. 94-142 is the classroom teacher. This population represents the largest population in need of training, as well as the one with the greatest training needs. (pp. 475-478)

Warnat (1978) made the following recommendations:

1. Inservice training must concentrate on the critical need population, namely regular classroom teachers.

2. School systems must develop an organizational process equipped to handle areas pertaining directly to the educational service delivery models provided for handicapped students and its educational personnel.

3. Higher education must assume its share of responsibility in preparing educators to serve handicapped students. Preparation must go beyond specialized degree programs if it is to assist school systems in their inservice training efforts. (p. 479)

The National Education Association (NEA) is convinced that no single factor is of greater importance to successful implementation of P.L. 94-142 than the appropriate education of staff members. As a result, the NEA (1978) filed the following report on teacher training programs:

> There is general agreement among educators and parents that current teacher training programs are inadequate to prepare teachers to work effectively with handicapped children (NEA, 1978). The organization further states that most inservice training appears to be aimed at "regular" educators. If there is training for special educators it is secondary, or

> not at all. Often this training is aimed at developing knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes about handicapped children. More emphasis must be placed in the areas of deficiency. Special educators are most deficient in appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes. Additional training must be given to special educators when they are asked to assume supportive and indirect service roles. (p. 27)

NEA further stated that state departments of education and local education agencies should develop plans for preservice and inservice education of general and special educators. NEA made the following recommendations:

1. State departments of education, intermediate education agencies, local school systems, teacher organizations and teacher education institutions should organize together to develop preservice and inservice teacher education courses in special education. Courses that are of clear practical value and relevant to school and classroom realities.

2. State commissions on teacher licensing and certification should work together with state advisory councils on special education. The commission needs to revise teacher certification standards to require special education coursework designed to prepare general education teachers to work with handicapped children in general education classrooms. (p. 29)

Inservice Training

Changes in special education are occurring so rapidly that training cannot keep up with the pace (Reynolds & Birch, 1977). More of what is needed may be "re-training" for special education teachers, school psychologists and other school workers (Reynolds & Birch, 1977). According to the Special Education Media Bureau of the Chicago Public School System, special education teachers have not received inservice on P.L. 94-142 since 1979 (Special Education Media Bureau, Personal Communication, October, 1985). In addition, at the end of those inservice sessions, no follow up was administered to examine teachers' interpretation of P.L. 94-142.

The methods of training good teachers are based more on past principles than on knowledge (Ysseldyke & Algozzine, 1982). The authors found that preservice training programs are largely academic and that entrance requirements depend on the courses taken. Howsam (1980) pointed out that the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) recognizes three levels of teacher education: preservice, inservice, and continuing education. Preservice preparation takes place prior to entrance into the field. Inservice and continuing education are necessary to help teachers adjust to particular requirements of the work place or to keep up with changes in the field. Howsam (1980) concluded that because of the lack of initial preparation, inservice education is retraining personnel rather than supplementing their professional growth.

The requirements of P.L. 94-142 created a need for inservice training. It is important to consider the models through which inservice training is delivered and the effectiveness (Siantz & Moore, 1978). The authors stated:

> One shot workshops are not sufficient; training must address over a period of time and indepth, the knowledge and skills needed to teach children with specific disabilities in a specific subject area . . . this kind of training may focus on special education content, operational service delivery systems, or other skill areas needed for the creation of professional development programs. (p. 79)

Special education teachers are often trained in diagnostic prescriptive teaching strategies rather than practices of formulating instructional prescriptions on the basis of different diagnostic results (Arter & Jenkins, 1979).

Special Education Personnel

Individual state education agencies are experimenting with various techniques to improve their personnel development for special education teachers. The New Jersey Mainstreaming Inservice Project (Nadler, Mirron, & Friedel, 1981) was conducted in response to the challenge of personnel development under P.L. 94-142. The project was predicated upon the assumption that collaboration among and within different educational institutions is central to effective staff development and wide spread change. Since September, 1977 the New Jersey State Department of Education, 50 local school districts, and 5 institutions of higher education have engaged in a joint effort to provide school personnel with the knowledge and skill required to meet the needs to educate handicapped children. Each participating local agency designates an inservice coordinator who has the responsibility for implementing a district-developed grant proposal. A full time faculty member from the five participating institutions of high education serves as consultant to a group of ten local education agencies inservice coordinators. The primary responsibility of the faculty member is to provide consultation that encourages district representatives as to plan, develop, implement, and evaluate inservice efforts.

The Teacher Education Division (TED) of the Council for Exceptional Children is conducting the final phase of a study (1986) designed to develop a set of quality practices in personnel preparation for special education. The purpose of the study is twofold:

1. To assist the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to redesign its standards and procedures for preservice programs; and

2. To develop a statement of practices that members would endorse an enhancing the quality of teacher education programs in special education. (p. 5-6)

The first phase of the study was a validation study of the quality practices (Appendix C). More than 2300 professionals in the field of special education participated in the study.

The quality practices were presented for the approval to members at the TED Business Meeting that was held on Tuesday, April 1, 1986 at the CEC Convention in New Orleans. Members that were present at the meeting were asked to mail in their votes. Final results and conclusions on the practice qualities for special education teachers are not published at this time.

Ganschow, Weber and Davis (1984) examined certification requirements for elementary and secondary teachers, with regard to changes of P.L. 94-142. Questionnaires were sent to commissioners of education (SEA) in all 50 states. Follow up phone calls were made to those that had not responded to the first inquiry. Each SEA was asked the following question: "What undergraduate preparation for working with exceptional children is required of regular elementary and secondary teacher certification in your state?"

Results of the survey showed that 14 SEAs had no specific certification requirement; 17 SEAs required one course on exceptionalities; 2 SEAs had one required course pending; 2 SEAs had a two-course requirement; 7 SEAs had specific guidelines; and 8 SEAs made general reference to competencies about handicaps in their guidelines. The authors stated that SEAs must assume leadership in mandating training relevant to handicapping conditions before receiving teaching certificates. Fourteen SEAs had no specific course requirement, and 15 SEAs had only

guidelines and mandates. Findings indicated that a majority of the SEAs had not fulfilled their commitment of training regular teachers to assume responsibility for educating exceptional children.

Sametz and McLoughlin (1984), surveyed preservice and practicing teachers' knowledge of students' legal rights. The Survey of Children's Legal Rights was developed to assess educators knowledge of legal issues affecting children. It was hypothesized that experienced teachers would be more aware of legal issues affecting children than preservice teachers. The researchers anticipated that preservice seniors would be more knowledgeable of students' rights than sophomores. The survey contained the following 11 themes:

1. child abuse
2. freedom of speech and press
3. suspension and expulsion from school
4. corporal punishment
5. juvenile court hearings
6. special education
7. freedom of religion
8. search and seizure within school
9. divorce and child custody
10. school vandalism
11. school attendance. (p. 114)

The survey was administered to 388 undergraduates at a midwestern college of education. There were 248 sophomores and 140 seniors. One hundred seven practicing teachers were surveyed. The teachers taught in grades ranging from K-12. The mean grade was 4.71. The average years

of experience was 9.38. Sixteen of the teachers had a master's degree and 88 had a bachelor's degree.

The questions under theme #6 included the following:

1. parents right to notice at time of referral
2. need for parent permission for evaluation
3. parent's permission for subsequent special education placement
4. parent's right to review school file
5. parent's right to immediate access to their child's school file.

Subjects were asked to rate each item on a five-point Likert scale. The following alternatives were given: 1) definitely true, 2) probably true, 3) unsure, 4) probably false, and 5) definitely false. Table 1 presents the breakdown of data from theme #6.

TABLE 1

SPECIAL EDUCATION ANSWERS

Question	Sophomore % Correct	Seniors % Correct	Teachers % Correct
1.	88.2	91.4	89.7
2.	14.6	17.3	28.0
3.	69.2	78.4	88.8
4.	48.2	44.6	26.2
5.	4.4	3.6	.9

In summary, Sametz and McLoughlin (1984) reported response patterns to some questions revealed serious deficiencies in knowledge. In spite of the contemporary emphasis on the mainstreaming of handicapped children, as a result of P.L. 94-142, practicing educators and students appeared uncertain about the mandate. The researchers concluded that teachers' correct responses on question #3 (parents' permission for special education placement) may be attributed to direct experience. On items relating to the child's rights to review school files, all three groups of subjects revealed confusion. The prospective educators were significantly ($p < .05$) more accurate than the practicing educators. The authors felt that students did better on this question because in schools, administrators, not teachers, grant parents permission to review files.

Sametz and McLoughlin (1984) concluded that the colleges of education need to be responsive to our increasingly litigious society. Colleges of education need to incorporate courses about the law into the curriculum of teacher preparation programs. Such knowledge is crucial to the definition and fulfillment of the teacher's professional responsibilities.

Hisama and Rainey (1982) conducted a study to investigate "six" variables as predictors of teaching competencies needed by special education teachers. The investigators identified 17 teaching competencies necessary for teachers who teach the mentally retarded (MR), behaviorally disordered (BD) and learning disabled (LD) students. The importance of each competency was evaluated and validated by three groups of professionals: special education supervisors, college graduates and supervising teachers.

The subjects used in this study were 105 college graduates who had completed the bachelor degree in education. Three criteria were established for the selected subjects:

1. the graduate had to have certification in at least one area of specialization -- MR, BD or LD
2. passing an interview, and
3. minimum six months teaching experience with handicapped children.

Special education field supervisors, directors, head teachers and principals received the mailed questionnaires. Those individuals receiving the questionnaires were in positions to evaluate the teaching performance of the teachers participating in this investigation. Respondents were asked to judge the 17 teaching competencies shown by the graduates. Of the 160 questionnaires sent, 109 responses were returned. A total of 105 questionnaires were used. The returned questionnaires were checked against admissions records used by the investigators. The admission records contained four predictors:

1. the overall grade point average (GPA),
2. previous experience with handicapped children,
3. motivation for teaching handicapped children, and
4. positive and healthy personality of the applicant.

The results revealed that the final grade in student teaching correlated with five criterion measures at the .01 level of significance. The students' overall GPA correlated with three dependent variables at the .01 level of significance. A relatively higher value of student teaching performance as a predictor of teaching competency is

not surprising because student teaching simulates the real teaching situation (Hisama & Rainey, 1982).

As a result of this study, revisions in method courses were implemented. Of the four predictors obtained from the interview sessions, "healthy personality", "motivation to teach handicapped students," and "previous experience with handicapped children" can be used. However, the authors concluded that the best predictor is the overall GPA.

Project RETOOL (Heller & Schilit, 1980) selected four institutions of higher education (IHE) and one state education agency to develop inservice education models for practicing educators in special education. The IHEs selected were as follows:

1. San Diego State University
2. University of Kentucky
3. University of Missouri at Columbia
4. University system of North Carolina
5. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Project RETOOL was an attempt to respond to the inservice needs of colleges of education special education educators. Inservice needs were validated through a needs assessment administered to 474 practicing teachers in special education in the following 14 states: 1) Alabama, 2) California, 3) Colorado, 4) Connecticut, 5) Georgia, 6) Kansas, 7) Kentucky, 8) Massachusetts, 9) Missouri, 10) Nebraska, 11) New Jersey, 12) New York, 13) North Carolina, and 14) Virginia.

Several basic conclusions were drawn from the needs assessment data. The most notable conclusions were as follows:

1. Almost 75% of the faculty responding indicated a willingness to participate in continuing education.

2. Slightly more than 60% had received their primary training in special education. The remaining 39.5% represented education in various disciplines.

3. The majority had been in the academic community for a period of 6-10 years.

4. Approximately 40% of the faculty interviewed had two years or less teaching experience with handicapped students. Almost 18% of the faculty had no previous experience with handicapped students prior to the acceptance of the college or university position.

5. Of those responding, 92% indicated a real need for some type of retraining through a project like RETOOL.

6. The topical conference approach was the method of retraining selected most often.

7. The 10 most desired inservice techniques were (in order):

   a. topical conference

   b. short-site visits

   c. independent studies

   d. summer workshops

   e. bi-district fellowships

   f. faculty exchange

   g. workshops

   h. media packages

   i. programmed materials

   j. return to classroom teaching. (p. 58)

In summary, Project RETOOL illustrated the need for planned and systematic inservice education for teacher educators in special education. It represented a significant effort to improve the quality of special education by assuring that those individuals who are charged with preparing personnel maintain their skills and competencies at the highest level of effectiveness.

Herr and Algozzine (1976) conducted a study to devise an extensive and intensive plan for ascertaining and validating teacher competencies for special education teachers to educate handicapped students. The instrument used for the study was the special education teacher competency checklist (SEICCL). It consisted of 162 competency statements compiled from an extensive literature review and a seven-point rating scale, ranging from Very Important (7 points) to Not Important (1 point). The SETCCL was sent to the following teachers:

1. teachers of resource emotionally disturbed (ED) students
2. teachers of self-contained ED students
3. teachers of self-contained MR students
4. teachers of resource LD students
5. teachers of self-contained LD students

Herr and Algozzine (1976) devised eight phases of implementation for validating teacher competencies (Appendix D). The purpose of the Herr and Algozzine (1976) study was to implement phases 1, 2 and 3. It involved: a) compiling an extensive list of competencies perceived by professionals in special education; b) asking special education teachers to rate the competencies according to their perceived employment; c) factor analyzing the ratings and eliminating competency clusters.

The results of the Herr and Algozzine (1976) study demonstrated that the majority of the competencies were perceived as important. Eighty-seven percent of the items were rated as important by all subjects. The average correlation coefficient for all the groups was .78. The authors concluded that developing competencies for special education teachers must be a coordinated effort. Professionals must be

committed to such a goal, work together, share, and assimilate results. The following recommendations were made:

1. Professionals in special education assimilate the existing findings related to competency necessary to special education teachers.

2. Replications of this study should be made in different parts of the country. In addition to studying the variables included in this study, the effects of other variables, such as sex of teachers, age of teachers, personality types of teachers, and location of the school should be isolated.

3. After these replications, a factor analysis of the data from all investigations should be completed.

4. The other recommended steps should be initiated and completed.

5. Continued efforts should be made to design and/or refine test instruments for studying the effectiveness and necessity of teacher competencies in special education. (p. 104-106)

Dreibelbis (1981) reviewed a research paper that surveyed 1,105 special education teachers in Pennsylvania on their views of P.L. 94-142. Forty-seven percent (47%) of the sample returned the questionnaire. The respondents reported they had received sufficient inservice training for interpreting their students' folders. The teachers also felt that the students in their classrooms had been evaluated accurately. Almost 50% of the respondents reported that the psychological information they received about their students was insufficient for preparing individual education plans (IEPs). The special education teachers felt that pupils and parents had benefited from P.L. 94-142. They also felt that the law had helped them to prepare better education programs. Sixty percent (60%) responded that P.L. 94-142 had not ended inadequate education. Fifty-eight percent (58%) responded that P.L. 94-142 had not ended inappropriate classification. Fifty-seven percent (57%) responded that P.L. 94-142 had not ended inappropriate education programs. Approximately 45% agreed that P.L.

94-142 had not put an end to the exclusion of students from mainstream school life.

Queen and Grets (1982) wanted to know if teachers' college supervisors and cooperating teachers prepared them well during student teaching for their first classroom positions They surveyed 3,778 first-year teachers in North Carolina. Sixty-three percent (63%) of them responded. Of those responding, 91.6% were graduates of colleges or universities in North Carolina. Twenty-eight percent (28%) were early childhood teachers; 15% were elementary teachers, 24.9% were middle/junior high school teachers, and 23.5% were high school teachers. Another 8.5% were classified as resource, special education, or fine arts teachers. More than half (53.9%) were 19 to 24 years old, 33% were 25-30 years old, and 13.1% were older than 30. Approximately 60% of the respondents agreed that their preservice program had prepared them adequately for the first year of teaching. However, they gave low grades to their teacher-training institutions for not preparing them adequately to teach learning-disabled children.

Newcomer (1982) assessed 261 learning disabilities professionals' proficiency on the Council for Learning Disabilities (CLD) competency statements in eleven areas. The evaluation included ratings of real competencies (skills used on their jobs), and ideal competence (skills participants considered important for functioning at maximum efficiency). The 11 competency areas were reading, mathematics, cognition, spelling, oral language, written expression, behavior management, career/vocational education, counselling/consulting, educational operation, and historical/theoretical perspectives. A questionnaire was devised utilizing the competency statements. The

questionnaires were mailed to CLD members who had volunteered to assist in the data gathering. Response ranged from sluggish to slow to non-existent. The questionnaire was lengthy. Over a two-year period approximately 500 returns were accumulated. Of these, 261 were judged complete enough for inclusion in the study.

Total sample mean ratings were computed for each of the eleven competency areas. The differences between ideal competencies and real competencies mean ratings were measured with t-tests. The sample was divided into subgroups based upon nine demographic conditions: 1) teaching level, 2) service model, 3) years of teaching experience, 4) school type, 5) years of special education experience, 6) degree, 7) location, 8) sex, and 9) age. One way ANOVAs were computed to measure differences among subgroups mean scores for each condition. Interaction effects were examined for the Teaching Level and Services Model conditions.

Results revealed that reading was the most important competency area. Competence in cognition and career/vocational education was not viewed important. Areas such as mathematics, written language, and oral language were regarded as important. Results suggested that teachers benefit from experience and academic degrees but have little interest in research or professional organizations.

Carrin (1985) conducted a study in Georgia to determine whether there were similar skills/competencies needed by teachers of the learning disabled (LD), behaviorally disordered (BD) and mentally handicapped (MH). Three hundred survey forms were distributed to special education teachers in the public schools. One hundred eighty (60%) respondents returned the questionnaire. Twenty completed forms

were randomly selected for each of the groups. A t-test was used to measure the different competencies among the three groups. The instrument measured the following nine areas of instructional process:

1. planning instruction
2. conducting instruction
3. performing administrative duties
4. communicating/interacting
5. developing pupil self-confidence
6. assessing/evaluating
7. curriculum design use
8. personal/professional growth
9. professional information

Carrin (1985) stated that in certain states resource room teachers are certified as interrelated or cross-categorical teachers without preparation courses in all the areas in which they are expected to teach. Results indicated that teachers of LD and MR students shared similar views concerning skills/competencies needed, while teachers of BD students differed significantly ($p < .05$). Significant findings ($p < .05$) were also indicated in the following areas:

1. assessing and evaluating pupil behavior
2. curriculum design use
3. professional information

As a result of these findings, the researcher recommended that the assessment, evaluation and professional information traditionally stressed in all teacher training programs should be re-examined. Carrin (1985) also recommended the continuation of cross-categorical teacher certification. He stressed that teacher preparation programs and state

departments of education should reevaluate the requirements for special education degrees and/or certification. Specific coursework by categorical area in the three areas (BD, LD, and MR) may be needed.

McLoughlin and Kelly (1982) studied the problems of resource teachers of LD students and EMH students. The researchers primarily wanted the teachers to identify and prioritize the problems of resource teachers. A questionnaire of 35 statements concerning important aspects of the resource room model was mailed to 89 resource teachers. The statements were based upon resource room problems identified by a review of the literature and interviews with resource teachers. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of personal difficulty with each problem using the following scale: 1 = not at all a problem; 2 = somewhat a problem; 3 = usually a problem; and 4 = always a problem. Teachers were also asked to indicate who could best help them solve the problem: 1) teacher training institution, 2) school district, 3) some other agency or person, 4) more than one of these, and/or 5) none of these. A space for comments was allocated after each statement. Each teacher was also asked to report the following demographic data: 1) teacher type (LD or EMH), 2) teaching level, 3) teaching experience, and 4) teaching background (regular classroom, special class, and/or resource room).

After a follow-up letter, the total response rate was 89%. Fifty-six percent (56%) of those responding were LD teachers, 44% were EMH teachers, 77% were elementary teachers, and 23% were junior high school teachers. Forty-six percent (46%) had five years or less teaching experience, 54% had more than six years teaching experience.

Forty-seven percent (47%) functioned as resource teachers and 53% transferred from regular or special classes.

Results from the McLoughlin and Kelly (1982) study indicated that the teachers identified priority problems and concerns in the following order: 1) policy and procedures, 2) attitude, 3) time, 4) materials, and 5) instructional skills. Policies and procedures represented the largest troublesome area for the respondents. Procedures for choosing students as candidates for mainstreaming were questioned by more EMH teachers. The investigators felt this was true due to the difficulty of mainstreaming EMH students. Other problems perceived by resource teachers were the maximum number of students in a class and the maximum number allowed by state regulations.

In summary, the researchers suggested a course of action for this particular school district. The need exists to reexamine policies and procedures regarding resource rooms. Both local and state agencies must work together to improve current rules and regulations to support resource teachers in their work. Finally, the researchers suggested inservice training for teachers. The emphasis of the inservice training should focus on procedures and writing curriculum (McLoughlin & Kelly, 1982).

Summary

Historically, the education and training of special education teachers took place at institutions. Teachers learned by working with children exhibiting and/or possessing handicaps. As the needs increased for teachers of the handicapped, teacher preparation programs in special education were established.

Special education reform was substantiated with federal legislation. The laws authorized grants to universities/colleges to train personnel of the mentally retarded, and other disability areas. The most forceful piece of legislation for the handicapped was P.L. 94-142. It includes a personnel training section which clearly states the responsibility of the states' colleges/universities, and local education agencies when training special education personnel.

Inservicing special education personnel in schools is a frequently used method of informing and keeping personnel abreast of trends in the field. However, one shot workshops are not sufficient. Inservices must address the skills, as well as knowledge, to teach children with disabilities in a specific subject area.

Research with methods regarding special education personnel development is rapidly increasing. SEAs are funding projects by individuals and LEAs for personnel development as mandated under P.L. 94-142. Professional organizations have studied special education personnel preparation programs. The purpose of these studies are to assist in developing standards and procedures for preservice programs; and to develop a statement of practice for teacher education programs in special education. Other research on special education personnel involves validating teacher competencies for special education teachers; teachers views of P.L. 94-142; and how well college teachers prepared students for classroom positions.

The review of literature revealed minimal empirical data regarding the legal aspects of P.L. 94-142. However, there is evidence that experts are realizing that there is a need to educate teachers in the legal arena. Researchers suggested teachers become more acquainted with

the legal elements of their profession. Researchers also demonstrated the need for state education agencies to strengthen certification policies.

REFERENCES

Abeson (1979). Overview. In F. Weintraub & M. McCaffrey Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Alreck, P.L., & Settle, R. (1985). The survey research handbook. Homewood, IL: Irwin, Inc.

Anderson Publishing Company. (1986). How to get your survey returned. Minneapolis, MN: Anderson Publishing Company.

Arter, J. A., & Jenkins, J. R. (1379). Differential diagnosis-prescriptive teaching: Critical appraisal. Review of Educational Research, 49, 517-555.

Babbie, E. R. (1973). Survey research methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Bateman, B. D., & Herr, C. M. (1981). Law and special education. In J. M. Kaufman & D. P. Hallahan (Eds.), Handbook of special education (p. 338). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brown, L., & York, R. (1974). Developing programs for severely handicapped students. Teachers training and classroom instruction. Focus on Exceptional Children, 6(2), 28-32.

Burke, P. J. (1976). Personnel preparation: Historical perspective. Exceptional Children, 43, 144-147.

Burton, T., & Hirshoren, A. (1979). The education of severely and profoundly retarded children: Are we sacrificing the child to the concept? Exceptional Children, 45, 598-602.

Carrin, L. (1985). Inservice teachers' assessed needs in BD, MR, and LD: Are they similar? Exceptional Children, 51, 411-416.

Connor, F. P. (1976). The past is prologue: Teacher preparation in special education. Exceptional Children, 42, 365-378.

Craig, S. B. (1942). Fifty years of training teachers of the deaf. School and Society, 56, 301-303.

Cronbach, L. J. (1971). Test validation. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational measurement (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Dayton, C. M. (1970). The design of educational experiments. New York: McGraw-Hill.

de Jong, J. (1978). Objectives in training special teachers as derived from a task analysis of the teacher. In A. H. Fink, International perspectives on future special education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Dreibelbis, R. M. (1981). Views on Pennsylvania teachers on P.L. 94-142. KAPPAN, 63, 212.

Drew, C. J. (1980). Introduction to designing and conducting research. St. Louis, MO: Mosby Co.

Federal Register. (1977, August 23). Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142).

Fowler, F. T. (1985). Survey research methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing Co.

Ganschow, L., Weber, D., & Davis, M. (1984). Preservice teacher's preparation for mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 51, 157-160.

Gay, L. R. (1981). Educational research. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.

Gearheart, B. R., & Weishahn, M. W. (1980). The handicapped student in the regular classroom. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby Co.

Good, C. (Ed.). (1973). Dictionary of education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Gronlund, N. E. (1980). Measurement and evaluation in teaching. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Hardin, V. (1982). Designing continuing education programs for special educators. Exceptional Education Quarterly, 2, 69-78.

Heller, H. W., & Schilit, J. (1980). Project RETOOL: Models for updating teacher educators in special education. Exceptional Children, 47, 57-59.

Herr, D. E., & Algozzine, B. (1976). Competencies of teachers of the mildly handicapped. Journal of Special Education, 10, 97-106.

Hisama, T., & Rainey, D. (1982). How can we tell good special education teachers before they graduate - a predictive study of teaching competencies. Illinois Council for Exceptional Children Quarterly, 31, 28-30.

Howsam, R. B. (1980). The workplace: Does it hamper professionalization of pedagogy? KAPPAN, 62, 93-96.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1981). The Illinois primer on individualized education programs. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education and Illinois Regional Resource Center.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1986). A compendium of due process hearings. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Jacobs, J., Jacobs, J. F., & Janes, L. (1985). Research: Programs and implications. Special education and the training of public school administrators. Illinois Council for Exceptional Children Quarterly, 34, 16-19.

Lakin, K. C., & Reynolds, M. C. (1982). P.L. 94-142 as an organizing principle for teacher education curricula. In B. L. Sharp (Ed.), Dean's grant projects: Challenge and change in teacher education.

LaVor, M. L. (1976). Federal legislation for exceptional persons: A history. In F. Weintraub, Abeson, & LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Lincoln, D. F. (1903). Special classes for feeble-minded children in the Boston public schools. Journal of Psychoasthenics, 7, 83-93.

Lugo, D. E. (1978). A new alternative for the training of personnel for handicapped children. In A. H. Fink, International perspectives on future special education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Maher, C. A., & Bennett, R. E. (1984). Planning and evaluating special education services. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Mayer, M. (1961). The schools. New York: Harper & Row.

McLoughlin, C., & Kelly, D. (1982). Issues facing the resource teacher. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 5, 58-63.

McLoughlin, C., Sametz, & Streib, V. (1983). Perspective educators' knowledge of children's legal rights. American Educational Research Journal, 20(4), 591-600.

McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (1984). Research in education. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co.

Melcher, J. W. (1976). Law, litigation and handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 43, 126-130.

Nadler, B., Mirron, M., & Friedel, W. K. (1981). P.L. 94-142: One response to the personnel development mandate. Exceptional Children, 47, 463-464.

National Education Association. (1978). A study report: Education for all handicapped children: Consensus, conflict and challenge. Washington, DC: National Education Association of the United States.

Newcomer, P. (1982). Competencies for professionals in learning disabilities. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 5, 241-252.

Ogletree, E., & Garrett, W. (1981a). Teachers' knowledge of school law. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 869)

Ogletree, E. J., & Garrett, W. (1981b). Legal issues in education: A review of research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 738)

Queen, J. A., & Grets, J. (1982). First-year teachers' perceptions of their preservice training. KAPPAN, 64, 215-216.

Reynolds, M. C. (1980). A common body of practice for teachers: The challenge of P.L. 94-142 to teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Reynolds, M. C. (1982). Facing the future in dean's grant projects. In B. L. Sharp (Ed.), Dean's grant projects: Challenge and changes in teacher education.

Reynolds, M. C., & Birch, J. W. (1977). Teaching exceptional children in all America's schools. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Sametz, L., & McLoughlin, C. S. (1984). Curriculum innovation: Legal education. Education Horizons, 62, 113-115.

Sarason, S. B., & Doris, J. (1979). Educational handicap, public policy and social history. New York: Free Press.

Scheurman, N. (1976). A teacher's perspective. In M. A. Thomas (Ed.), Hey, don't forget about me. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Schleier, L. M. (1931). Problems in the training of certain special class teachers. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Siantz, J., & Moore, E. (1978). Inservice programming and preservice priorities. In J. Smith (Ed.) Personnel preparation and P.L. 94-142: The map, the mission and the mandate (2nd ed.). Boothwyn, PA: Educational Resources Center.

Smith, R. M. (1970). The development and maintenance of teacher competencies in special education. In A. Biacchi, The training needs of educators of the handicapped. Dissertation Abstracts International, 80, 14521.

Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children. (1986). The validation of quality practices in personnel preparation for special education. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Thiagarajan, S., Semmel, D. S., & Semmel, M. I. (1974). Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Tobias, R. (1983). SETRC basic training programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 922)

Tucker, D. J., & Horner, R. D. (1977). Competency-based training of paraprofessional teaching associates for education of the severe/profound handicapped. In A. Biacchi, The training needs of educators of the handicapped. Dissertation Abstracts International, 80, 14521.

Warnat, W. (1978). Inservice education: Key to P.L. 94-142's service to handicapped children and youth. Educational Leadership, 35, 474-479.

Weinlander, A. A. (1984). How to prepare for the national teacher examinations: Core battery and most specialty area tests. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.

Weintraub, F., & McCaffrey, M. (1976). Professional rights and responsibilities. In F. Weintraub, A. Abeson, J. Ballard, & M. LaVor (Eds.), Public policy and the education of exceptional children. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Wilcox, B. (1977). A competency-based approach to preparing teachers of the severe/profound handicapped: Perspective I. In A. Biacchi, The training needs of educators of the handicapped. Dissertation Abstracts International, 80, 14521.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. (1982). Critical issues in special and remedial education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co.

Zettel, J. J., & Ballard, J. (1983). The education for all handicapped children act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142): Its history, origin and concepts. In J. Ballard, B. A. Ramirez, & F. T. Weintraub (Eds.), Special Education in America: Its legal and governmental foundation. Reston, Va: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Zirkel, P. (1983). A test on supreme court decisions affecting education. In Menacker & Pascarella, "How aware are educators of Supreme Court decisions that affect them?" Kappan, 64, 424-426.